

**REMARKS**

By this amendment, claims 22-48 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 49-82 have been added. Support for the new claims is found in the specification. No new matter has been introduced. Claims 49-82 are presently pending in this application. Reconsideration of this application for allowance of all pending claims are hereby respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

In Section 7 of the Office Action, dated June 27, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 22-48 under 35 U.S.C. §101, asserting that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. By this amendment, claims 22-48 have been canceled, the rejection of claims 22-48 is moot.

As to the newly added claims 49-82, the Applicants respectfully point out that they are directed to machine implemented method (independent claims 49, 60, 74) and system (independent claim 61) as well as machine readable medium (independent claim 70). All independent claims recite functions achieved by employing the machine implemented method or system or by executing machine instructions stored on a machine readable medium that carry out the machine implemented method. The content recited in the claims corresponds to digital information (content) that is processed by a computer or device. Therefore, neither "the content" nor the "one or more translatable component" correspond to "non-functional descriptive material". In addition, all independent claims further recite "generating statistics based on one or more translatable components". The statistics are generated by the machine implemented method or system or by executing machine instructions stored on a machine readable medium that carry out the machine implemented method. That is, independent claims 49-82 are not

directed to a process that consists solely of the manipulation of an abstract idea. The new claims 49-82 are directed to a computational process and system that produces “useful, concrete and tangible result”. Therefore, the new claims 49-82 are directed to patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

In Section 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 22-27, 29-38, 40-44, and 46-48 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,526,426, issues to Lakritz (hereafter Lakritz)). By this Amendment, claims 22-27, 29-38, 40-44, and 46-48 have been canceled. The rejection is moot.

Regarding new claims 49-82, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 49-82 are not anticipated by Lakritz. Independent claims 49, 60, 61, 70, and 74 recite “parsing the content into one or more translatable components”. The Applicants respectfully point out that Lakritz does not teach this claimed feature. The Examiner asserts that “Lakritz discloses parsing the content into components” and cited Lakritz “The parser converts the document into the internal format.” (Column 10, lines 14-15). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Lakritz teaches a translation management and process control system (see Abstract, Column 3, line 16) that provides user interfaces to enable a user to update content in different languages, initiate translation jobs using appropriately selected translation resources, and facilitate end user’s browsing activities (see column 3, lines 16-37). To manage content translation, the Lakritz’s system directs each translation job to an appropriately selected translation resource (see Fig. 9, Column 9, line 64 – Column 10, line 1). Since each translation resource may require the content to be translated in a certain format (e.g., HTML), the content to

be translated may need to be converted first into that format before sending it to a selected translation resource. The format used by the Lakritz's system to store content therein is called internal format. When the internal format is not what's required by the translation resource, a conversion is carried out (see Column 10, lines 1-7). In addition, when the translation is completed (by a translation resource elsewhere) and the translated content is returned to the translation management system from the translation resource, the format used in the translated content may not correspond to the internal format. If so, the Lakritz's system converts the returned format back to the internal format (see Column 10, lines 7-15). Furthermore, when the content in internal format is sent to a destination, the format required by the destination may not be the same as the internal format and if so, Lakritz's system converts the internal format to a destination format (see Column 10, lines 15-20).

As the Examiner correctly cited, Lakritz's parser "converts the document into the internal format". Ordinarily, the term "parse" means "to divide language into small components that can be analyzed." (see <http://isp.webopedia.com/TERM/P/parse.html>), "to break down into its component parts" (<http://www.answers.com/topic/parsing>), or consistently "to break it up into smaller parts" (<http://www.techterms.org/definition/parse>). Clearly, Lakritz defines his parser to perform different functions as what an ordinary parser performs. It is well established in the U.S. Patent Laws, an inventor is permitted to be his own lexicographer. Therefore, although the ordinary meaning of term "parse" differs from what Lakritz's teaching, the intrinsic evidence in Lakritz controls the meaning of the term "parsing" used in Lakritz's teaching. Therefore, "parsing" in Lakritz means "format conversion", which is not "parsing the content into one or more translatable components", as recited in the independent claims 49, 60, 61, 70, and 74. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Lakritz fails to teach the claim element

“parsing the content into one or more translatable components”, recited in each and every independent claim.

It is well-settled that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

*Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since Lakritz fails to disclose and teach at least one claim element recited in independent claims 49, 60, 61, 70, and 74, the Applicants respectfully submit that Lakritz does not anticipate claims 49, 60, 61, 70, and 74. Therefore, claims 49, 60, 61, 70, and 74 are patentable.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In Section 34 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected dependent claims 38, 39, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lakritz. By this Amendment, claims 38, 39, and 45 have canceled and therefore the rejection is moot.

Regarding new claims 49-82, the Applicants respectfully submit that Lakritz does not render claims 49-82 obvious. As discussed above, Lakritz does not teach “parsing the content into one or more translatable components”, as recited in independent claims 49, 60, 61, 70, and 74. According to MPEP §2142, to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. The Applicants respectfully submit that Lakritz has no motivation to suggest the feature of “parsing the content into one or more translatable components”. Lakritz teaches a translation management and process control system (see Abstract, Column 3, line 16) that provides user interfaces to enable a user to update content in different languages, initiate translation jobs using appropriately selected translation resources, and facilitate end user’s browsing activities (see

column 3, lines 16-37). Relevant to language translation, Lakritz's teaching is merely to channel a translation job to and from a translation resource rather than any aspect of language translation itself. Lakritz does not suggest or has the motivation to suggest "parsing the content into one or more translatable components". Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims 49, 60, 61, 70, and 74 are not obvious over Lakritz and are patentable.

**Dependent claims:**

Since new independent claims 49, 60, 61, 70, and 74 are patentable for the reasons discussed above, claims that depend from the independent claims are patentable at least for the reasons stated above with respect to the independent claims and for the additional features recited therein.


Accordingly, it is believed that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests an early and favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application. If there are any outstanding issues which might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's representative at the telephone number shown below.

**Application No.: 10/784,334**

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Gene Z. Robinson

Registration No. 33,351

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 GZR/QH:llg  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: September 27, 2006**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**

WDC99 1289033-1.074869.0014